

Appln Ser No. 10/828,575
Amdt dated July 9, 2007
Reply to Office Action of January 8, 2007

App 1566

REMARKS

Claims 1 to 19 remain in the application.

The claimed invention in general concerns querying any of a plurality of target databases for one or more target database records that match an input data query where one or more reference databases is queried for matches to the input data, and if a match is found in the reference database(s), any of a plurality of target databases is queried for records that correspond to the reference database record. That is, in accordance with the claimed invention, prior to querying a target database(s) with input data from a requesting source, the input data is first compared to a reference database using a set of "reference-based mapping rules." The reference database is relatively static and is presumed to be cleansed, thereby making the reference database more accurate than the actual target databases. Accordingly, the intent of matching the input data to the reference source is to validate the input data and to ensure it is complete, non-ambiguous, and correct/free of errors.

For the reasons set forth below, it is respectfully submitted that the art of record fails to anticipate or render obvious claims 1-19 pending the present application.

Claims 1-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because in independent claims 1 and 7 the last step is "if a matching reference record is found" it gives a result but it does not recite what happens if no match is found.

Claim 2 recited "further comprising the step of generating a request to enter a new input data query if a reference database record is not found." Claim 1 claims the steps of the invention if a match is found and claim 2 contains the step the Examiner is seeking.

Regarding claim 7, if there is no match the method is complete until there is a new input data query.

Appln Ser No. 10/828,575
Amdt dated July 9, 2007
Reply to Office Action of January 8, 2007

App 1566

Claim 16 is amended by this amendment by adding the words "in a processor" consonant with the Examiner's suggestion. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-19 comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claims 1-7 and 10-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Moon et al (US Patent Application 2003/0177118).

Moon et al concerns the classification of documents, and more particularly to classification engines that classify documents by performing similarity searches to match classification profile data to data found in external databases containing known class data. Moon et al does not perform input data matching as claimed by Applicants.

Moon et al may require one or more searches for each document to be classified. (0103). Moon et al scores the document prior to classification. However, Moon et al does not query a reference database for matches of input data and then if a match is found, querying a plurality of target databases for the one or more target database matches that correspond to the reference database record as claimed in claim 1. Moon et al neither queries nor finds a reference database record and then queries target database(s) for records that correspond to the reference database record as claimed in claim 1. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Moon et al fails to anticipate claim 1 and claim 1 should be deemed allowable over Moon et al.

Claims 2-6 are dependent upon claim 1, or upon a claim dependent on claim 1, and for the reasons set forth above are not anticipated by Moon et al and should likewise be deemed allowable over Moon et al.

With regard to claim 7, Moon et al does not teach the use of reference database(s) and target database(s) for querying target database(s) with an input data query as claimed in claim 7 where reference database(s) is queried for matches to input data and if a matching reference database record is found, the matching reference database record is used for subsequent querying of one or more target databases for one or more target

Appln Ser No. 10/828,575
Amdt dated July 9, 2007
Reply to Office Action of January 8, 2007

App 1566

database records. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 7 is not anticipated by Moon et al and should be deemed allowable over Moon et al.

Claims 10-15 are dependent upon claim 7, or upon a claim dependent on claim 7, and are not anticipated by Moon et al and should likewise be deemed allowable over Moon et al.

With the amendment to claim 16, it is respectfully submitted that claims 16-19 should now be deemed in condition for allowance.

Claim 9 is amended to correct an obvious typographical error.

Reexamination, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-19 remaining in the application are respectfully requested.

Authorization is hereby given to charge Deposit Account No. 02-1822 the fee due under 37 CFR 1.17(a) of \$1020.00 for a three (3) month extension of the time to reply to the Office Action.

Respectfully submitted,



Philip J. Feig
Registration No. 27,328
Telephone No. 732-699-7997